

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

*June 9, 2015
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	1
TPA Public Involvement	2
Debrief of Hanford Contractor Panel.....	3
Waste Treatment Plan Communications Strategy.....	4
Overview of Cleanup Decision Making Processes	5
HAB Member Self-Assessments.....	7
Committee Business	8
Attachments.....	10

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Steve Hudson, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Chair, welcomed everyone to the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) meeting and led a round of introductions. Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues facilitator, welcomed new board members.

The committee adopted the April 7 meeting summary. Meeting flip-chart notes are provided as Attachment 1.

Tom Galioto, Public-at-Large (to be appointed on June 30), said Liz Mattson, PIC chair, asked him to provide PIC with feedback he submitted for the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies Public Involvement Survey. He said he suggested PIC consider publishing a monthly or quarterly newsletter in the *Tri-City Herald*. Tom provided examples of the Tri-City Cancer Center's newsletter, which is six to eight pages long and addresses basic information as well as increases readers' understanding of what the Center does. He suggested current and past Board members, as well as agency representatives, contribute articles on timely issues of interest to the public. Tom said he knows the Center's newsletter is well-read because

community members have commented on it. He will work with the Center to identify the cost of publishing the newsletter as members questioned it and report back to the committee at their next meeting.

TPA Public Involvement

Introduction

Dieter Bohrmann, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), provided an overview of the TPA Public Involvement Calendar (Attachment 2), which is updated quarterly and before each Board meeting. It is available on Ecology's website (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/nwp/public.htm>).

Dieter reviewed upcoming public comment periods and issues to track through summer 2015, as well as holding bin items. For ongoing or upcoming events, Dieter specifically noted:

- The comment period for the Hanford Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 and 2017 Budget closes on June 15.
- Two Hanford Air Operating Permit comment periods are currently open and will close on July 3.
- The Proposed Plan for the amendment to the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility should be issued for public comment this summer after the package is finalized.
- The second public comment period for the Class III permit modification to the Closure Plan for the Outdoor Container Storage Pad will be held this summer, as well as the first comment period for the Class III permit modification to the Closure Plan for 207-A South Retention Basin at the end of June or early July.
- The comment period for the TPA M-91 milestone series, pertaining to transuranic (TRU) waste retrieval, repackaging, and storing, will be July 6 – August 21.

Dieter explained how the public process for Class I, II, and III permit modifications work. Class I is for small, administrative changes and does not require public input. Notifications on Class I changes are distributed four times a year. Class II has a comment period with a public meeting, hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). Class III is for the most significant changes and requires two comment periods: one hosted by DOE on the proposed modification, and one hosted by Ecology on the selected modification.

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, asked if Ecology has provided a web link to the Rotary Core Sampling Systems for Hanford's Tanks permit. Dieter confirmed the link is on the Ecology homepage.

Materials for PIC input

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said EPA recently updated language in the regulations for Superfund sites on administrative records. EPA previously required a hard copy of the record, as well as digital files. EPA is currently assessing how much the public accesses the hard copies in the DOE Administrative Record public access room in Richland and would like to distribute a survey for

public input to gage in-person and online access capabilities. If possible, EPA would like to eliminate hard copies and only maintain the administrative record online.

Emy distributed a draft handout for the TPA Administrative Record Public Survey and asked PIC members to return any feedback by the end of June. The survey will be direct-linked in an email to the Hanford listserv. Cathy will also distribute the handout electronically as part of the PIC meeting products.

Kris Skopeck, DOE – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), distributed the draft fact sheet for the 207-A South Retention Basin permit modification public comment period, as well as a copy of the 30-day notification email distributed by the Hanford Listserv. The fact sheet will be attached to the notification for the opening of the comment period, as well as be sent out as a hard copy to 1,900 subscribers. Kris asked that PIC input be provided as soon as possible, noting that in order to be succinct, the fact sheet provides links to further online information.

PIC members provided feedback on the email notification and fact sheet, specifically noting:

- The email should explain what “process condensate” is.
- The email is misleading because the 242-A Evaporator has been in use since 2014, but the language makes it sound like it is not.
- The fact sheet should include a statement about why the permit modification is important. It may not be a major cleanup issue, but closure of the unit will free up Hanford resources.
- Technical terms in the fact sheet should be simplified, explained, or eliminated.
- The term “draft change package” is used on the back side of the fact sheet and will be the first thing people see, but the term is not used or explained anywhere else.

Liz asked the agencies to allow PIC time to review public materials for the M-91 change package.

Debrief of Hanford Contractor Panel

Introduction

Liz spoke to the Contractor’s Panel from the April Board meeting and asked PIC members to provide feedback on what worked, what did not, and what can be changed for the future. She noted the awkwardness of the format for the question and answer period that did not allow for real time questions and comments from the Board. Liz reviewed a document compiled by Susan Leckband that identifies Board members questions and concerns following the panel (Attachment 3).

Committee Discussion

The following key points were noted during committee discussion:

- PIC members were impressed by the contractor presentations and positivity about work on site. One member appreciated that they said no work at Hanford is too hazardous to be completed.

- Conversations held with contractors after the panel were more informal and informative. PIC agreed the Board should consider more opportunities to interact with contractors so the contractors have a better understanding of who their public is.
- The inability to ask questions or dive deeper into the details of contractor work was frustrating, though the contractors were able to provide more detail on specific projects than during the regular agency overviews. Having pre-approved questions detracts from an open interchange of information; DOE and the Board should insist DOE-Headquarters (HQ) give their contractors more freedom of discussion.
- One Board member would appreciate documentation for future presenters' credentials to better understand their authority on Hanford information.
- One Board member suggested a future contractor panel could include agency representatives so both sides can speak to a topic. Agency representatives are also allowed more interaction with the Board.

PIC determined to provide copies of the post-panel questions handout at the Board meeting. Board members will be asked to clarify their questions if needed, or let the EIC know if any of their questions did not get addressed during the June agency updates.

Cathy thanked Kris and Sharon Braswell, DOE-Office of River Protection (ORP)/North Wind, for organizing the contractor panel.

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Communications Strategy

Introduction

Liz said the purpose of the discussion is to further the development of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) Communications Strategy. She has drafted questions to include in a survey for Board members to help guide the development of the strategy and would like PIC's input to ensure they are the right questions. She noted the difficulty in receiving clarity from DOE-ORP on exactly what the Board should be providing input on. At the last PIC meeting, DOE-ORP said the Board should focus on high-level waste (HLW), the HLW Facility and safety design, full production engineering, and WTP integration as per the HAB FY 2015 Work Plan. Sharon provided background information on why the strategy, and the Board's input, are being requested, noting that DOE-ORP would like the Board's help in understanding what they should communicate when talking about HLW and the level of information to be presented depending on varying audiences. She said the Board should not be concerned with writing a specific plan, but provide high-level ideas for what and to whom to communicate. She said DOE-ORP will further define the scope of this request in the FY 2016 HAB Work Plan.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) issue manager, said TWC will focus on the technical side of what information to communicate, and they would like PIC to focus on how to communicate it and to whom. He said one level of information and presentation is not appropriate for all audiences, so the committees need to work to help identify the different audiences and levels of information.

Committee discussion

The following key points were noted during committee discussion:

- One PIC member asked the committee to take a step back to ask about the intent of the strategy and address issues concerning who will use the strategy and how it will address issues in the Consent Decree disputes on WTP timeframe and waste processing. He noted concern that DOE-ORP will treat a communications strategy as a public relations plan; regulators should be involved in developing and carrying out a communications strategy or it will not be effective. He asked if the strategy could instead be a public involvement plan that asks the public for their opinions on decisions and alternatives.
- One PIC member suggested the Board decline DOE-ORP's request to support development of the strategy, as they have been asking for the findings from Secretary Chu's panel that explored issues at WTP, but have still not received the information two years later. It would be impossible to communicate WTP to the public without all the information. Liz suggested adding a question to the survey to ask other Board members if they agree or disagree that development of the strategy is appropriate work for the Board and if they have enough information to move forward. Bob noted that TWC has many questions about foundational information to be communicated and does not have a clear path forward.
- The PIC discussed other valuable reports that should be addressed along with any communications about WTP, specifically mentioning the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report. The survey will include a question to other Board members asking which other reports should be addressed.
- Joni Grindstaff, DOE-ORP, said she understands it will be hard to communicate a holistic view of WTP, which is why DOE asked for the strategy to focus on communicating the need and progress of the Direct Feed Low Activity Waste Facility (DFLAW) and the HLW Facility. DOE needs to communicate that there were challenges, a path forward has been determined, and progress is being made.

Liz said she will continue working with Ken Niles, Oregon DOE (ODOE) and PIC vice-chair, to develop the Board survey for input and will return it for committee review. Cathy encouraged PIC members to attend the August TWC meeting for further discussion.

Overview of Cleanup Decision Making Processes

Introduction

Dale Engstrom, ODOE, provided a presentation detailing the different regulatory mechanisms that guide Hanford cleanup decisions and processes. His presentation is provided as Attachment 4. Copies of the presentation will be made available through email and the HAB SharePoint site. In addition to his presentation, Dale noted:

- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 was enacted to help identify the impacts of human actions on the environment, as well as identify solutions to avoid, minimize, and mitigate those impacts.
- Under NEPA, the environmental assessment determines whether there will be an impact, and the environmental impact statement (EIS) demonstrates the best ways to avoid those impacts and support decision making.
- The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 handles disposal of landfill waste and focuses on active and future facilities. At Hanford, RCRA is administered by Ecology for issues like the Single-Shell Tank Waste Retrieval Program and Central Waste Complex.
- The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, or the Superfund Act, is when one site is too big for any one entity or agency to clean up. Federal, state, and local agencies support funding to clean up abandoned waste sites and hold those who made the waste liable. The River Corridor was cleaned up under CERCLA.
- The Natural Resources Damage Assessment (NRDA) of 1980 is the restoration component to CERCLA's remediation efforts. The NRDA determines how cleaned up sites will move forward.
- Each regulatory process works in phases of regulator and public review to gather the right kind of information, get multiple levels of input, and make the best decisions.

Committee discussion

The following key points were captured during committee discussion:

- The RCRA, CERCLA, and NRDA processes occur at the same time to determine remediation and restoration. All processes occur simultaneously, but do not overlap. One process deals with radioactive materials while another deals with hazardous materials, for example. The TPA agencies work well together to ensure the processes run smoothly.
- The TPA is outside of the other regulatory processes, so the milestone change packages should not be associated with RCRA.
- Sometimes choices have to be made whether cleanup will be regulated by RCRA or CERCLA, and the Board has provided advice on such decisions. RCRA is more restrictive than CERCLA, but it is confusing how to handle an issue like a disposal facility leaking into the ground. CERCLA is exempt from the NEPA process while RCRA includes a NEPA process, which could make the difference between whether a public process is included in cleanup decisions.
- RCRA is a federal law, so EPA had to designate Ecology as the RCRA regulator at Hanford. Ecology also uses state Dangerous Waste Standards to permit and treat storage units. CERCLA work is divided between EPA and Ecology, who determine who should be the lead agency for any given issue. Regardless, both regulators have to approve records of decision. DOE is the

agency responsible for cleanup but works more cooperatively with Ecology and EPA than partnerships at some other Superfund sites.

- EPA, Ecology, and DOE have a clear process for interacting with each other, and provide ODOE, the tribes, and the Board early access to documents when possible in order to have a better influence on decisions.
- The committee discussed the complexities of applying regulations not written specifically for Hanford.
- When written, regulations did not consider tribal concerns or scenarios in effect at Hanford, but the tribes are included in the regulatory processes through government to government consultation. Tribal nations are also part of the NRDA committees making decisions for environmental restoration. The agencies work with the tribes on exposure scenarios and cultural resources they use, but sometimes expectations do not match up and state agencies have to ask DOE to be more protective of tribal interests and uses.

Liz asked the committee to consider whether informational tutorials are helpful in furthering understanding of how Hanford operates and they should be included as part of a PIC meeting

HAB Member Self-Assessments

HAB Member Self-Assessments

Dale spoke to ODOE's involvement in Portland area Science Pubs, which is a collaboration between the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry and local breweries. Participants listen to speakers on topics like soils, viticulture, and Hanford. Dirk Dunning and Ken Niles have spoken a number of times, reaching a different, younger audience than other Hanford involvement events.

Peggy Maze Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (HoANW), said HoANW co-hosted two more community-led State of the Site (SOS) meetings since the April meeting, with 100 people attending in both Walla Walla and Vancouver. Their outreach team also participated in a community celebration at Seattle University and have other routine outreach efforts.

Rich Marshall, DOE-ORP/NorthWind, said they recently participated in the Delta High School Career Day, and J.D. Dowell has spoken to engineering students at Eastern Washington University and Washington State University. Upcoming speaking engagements are planned with the Kennewick-Pasco Rotary Club and Bechtel's Women Leadership Conference.

Dieter said Ecology has many upcoming presentations to civic groups, with most recent engagements with Rotaries in Hermiston and Gresham, Oregon. He said Ecology's presentation at the community-led SOS meetings was more creative than usual in order to reach college students. It spoke to the top 10 reasons to be involved in Hanford cleanup. Dieter announced that Heather John will be leaving Ecology to move to New Jersey. Heather said PIC has been a great experience for her to see how people learn and interact with each other.

Kris said a number of Hanford Speaker's Bureau presentations have been scheduled, and she recently helped coordinate transportation for "Take Your Child" to work day, which included a special B Reactor tour. She said it was good to have relatively young children learning about Hanford, what their parents do there, and why it is important. Public tours of Hanford are now open, with a few more spots available online.

Jan Catrell, Public-at-Large, said she was recently sponsored by a church group to participate in an environmental justice legislative day in Washington D.C. She presented on coal trains and Native Americans petitioning about coal trains at Cherry Point. While in D.C., Jan had the opportunity to speak with Senator Cantwell and staffers at Senator Murray's office.

John Howieson, Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR), said he provided a 20-minute presentation on Hanford cleanup at the World Uranium Symposium in Quebec in April. He will provide a short report on his presentation and the conference at the next PIC meeting.

Daniel Noonan, PSR, said he helped co-host the SOS meetings and held a workshop for junior and high school teachers on teaching Hanford in the classroom. He has also been working with textbook producers on environmental issues. Daniel said 13 PSR members recently took the Hanford Site tour and were proud to have asked more questions than any other of their guide's tour groups.

Angie Malorni and Zoey Kapusinski, Hanford Challenge, said they were involved in student outreach and the citizen-led SOS meeting at Whitman College in Walla Walla, as well as other high school and college student outreach in the Seattle area, including an outdoor movie night. Angie said Hanford Challenge is working to develop high school programs, with two in the pipeline with the Yakama Nation and a school in Seattle.

Liz said Hanford Challenge distributed 500 postcards with Hanford facts at Whitman College, with a goal of having all the students know what Hanford is. She said students are interested in Hanford because they are so close, and professors have started teaching about it, like new Board member Alissa Corder. Hanford Challenge will be hosting two ice cream socials this summer that encourage engagement, learning, and action. The socials usually attract 70-80 people and are hosted in a Seattle park. They will be held from 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. on July 17 and August 28. Hanford Challenge recently participated in a high school classroom discussion about whistleblowers and Hanford.

Committee Business

Review of draft HAB FY 2016 Work Plan PIC topics

Cathy asked committee members to help fill in specific actions and provide context for the PIC-related items on the HAB FY 2016 Work Plan. Areas include HAB Outreach, Regional Public Meetings, and Youth Involvement. Context and specific actions area needed to help pass the plan through review with DOE-HQ.

Kris noted that for HAB Outreach, the agencies are interested in what HAB members are doing to provide outreach to their specific constituents on HAB activities.

The committee worked together to flesh out the context and upcoming actions for the work plan. The EIC will use the information to further develop the work plan before submitting it for agency review and approval, as well as Board approval.

Update committee's 3-month work plan

Cathy reviewed the PIC Three-month Work Plan for June to September, 2015.

Liz asked the committee to tentatively plan for a committee call in June to address the M91 change package. PIC will hold a call in August to plan for the September committee meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Flip-chart notes

Attachment 2: TPA Public Involvement Calendar

Attachment 3: Contractor Panel Follow-up Q&A handout

Attachment 4: Overview of Cleanup Decision Making Processes presentation

Attendees

Board members and alternates

Jan Catrell	Gary Garnant	Liz Mattson
Alissa Cordner (phone)	Rebecca Holland	Ken Niles (phone)
Sam Dechter	John Howieson	Gerry Pollet
Dale Engstrom	Steve Hudson	Bob Suyama
	Peggy Maze Johnson	

Others

Kristen Skopeck, DOE-RL	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues	Daniel Noonan, PSR
Joni Grindstaff, DOE-ORP (phone)	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues	Angie Malorni, Hanford Challenge
Vanessa Synoground, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, North Wind	Zoey Kapusinski, Hanford Challenge
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Rich Marshall, North Wind	Dylane Jacobs, HoANW
Heather John, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC	Chrissy Swartz, HoANW
Emy Laija, EPA	Tom Galioto	Alexandra Gilbert, HoANW